The Sadducees were doubtless far more familiar with the Old Testament soldy never in the Hebrew than they would be with the Septuagint, and would not think of the satisfied with accepting an argument based on a word in that imperfect translation. If we believe in the verbal inspiration of the verbal Old Testament, it seems to me that we must mean by that the inspiration of the original Hebrew manuscripts.

I have heard many instances of godly men in recent years preaching sermons in which they bese whole doctrines or interpretations on one word of the Scripture. Often these interpretations are extremely fantastic. I do not believe that it is the Lord's will that we should build arguments in this way. He presents the truth so clearly that a wayfaring man, though a fool, should not err therein. As further we study more deeply, we learn truths by compasing Scripture with upon We do not need to base doctrine en any one word or letter of the original. By verbal inspiration, I mean that the entire and Scripture Testament is so worded that it is kept free from errors of fact, of doctrine, or of judgment, and thus represents to us the very mind of I do not mean that it is so stated that we are justified in taking a verse or a phrase out of its context and basing an argument on it. Since I feel so strongly that this is a type of argument lending itself to all sorts of errors and one which ought to be avoided by us, I would feel it st strange if such a type of argument were used by the New Testament writer's themselves, As a matter of fact, I do not think that they did so. It is inconceivable to me that Paul could have based an trgument upon on of the Hebrew being in the singular, particularly when that very same word in the singular is used in the very next verse to indicate the great multitude of the seed which shall be so great that it can no more be numbered than can the send of the see T believe that the Septuagint also uses the singu-